arXiv:1610.06762v1 [q-bio.NC] 21 Oct 2016

DETECTING FUNCTIONAL DECLINE FROM NORMAL AGEING TO DEMENTIA: DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF A SHORT VERSION OF THE AMSTERDAM IADL QUESTIONNAIRE

ROOS J. JUTTEN*, CAREL F.W. PEETERS, SOPHIE M.J. LEIJDESDORFF, PIETER JELLE VISSER, ANDREA B. MAIER, CAROLINE B. TERWEE, PHILIP SCHELTENS, AND SIETSKE A.M. SIKKES

Abstract.
Introduction: Detecting functional decline from normal ageing to dementia is relevant for diagnostic and prognostic purposes. Therefore, the Amsterdam IADL Questionnaire (A-IADL-Q) was developed: A 70-item proxy-based tool with good psychometric properties. We aimed to design a short version whilst preserving its psychometric quality.
Methods: Study partners of subjects ($n = 1326$), ranging from cognitively normal to dementia subjects, completed the original A-IADL-Q. We selected the short version items using a stepwise procedure combining missing data, Item Response Theory and input from respondents and experts. We investigated internal consistency, correspondence with the original version and differences in IADL scores between diagnostic groups across the dementia spectrum.
Results: We selected 32 items covering the entire spectrum of IADL functioning. Internal consistency (.981) and correspondence with the original version (.976) were high. IADL impairment scores increased from normal cognition to dementia.
Discussion: The A-IADL-Q Short Version (A-IADL-Q-SV) is a concise measure of functional decline.

Key words: Alzheimer's disease; Dementia; Instrumental activities of daily living; Item response theory; Functional decline; Mild cognitive impairment; Subjective cognitive decline

Abbreviations: AD = Alzheimer's disease; A-IADL-Q = Amsterdam IADL Questionnaire; CFI = Comparative fit index; IADL = Instrumental activities of daily living; IIC = Item information curve; IRT = Item response theory; GRM = Graded response model; MCI = Mild cognitive impairment; MML = Marginal maximum likelihood; NC = Normal cognition; RMSEA = Root mean square error of approximation; SCD = Subjective cognitive decline; VAS = Visual analogue scale

1. Background

Dementia is a syndrome characterized by progressive cognitive decline and significant interference in daily function [1]. The first observable problems in daily life often concern the Instrumental Activities of Daily Living (IADL). IADL can be defined as 'complex activities for which multiple cognitive processes are necessary', such as cooking, managing finances and driving [2]. Detecting functional decline

*Corresponding author.

along the continuum from normal ageing to dementia is highly relevant for a number of reasons. First of all, subtle IADL problems may already be present in subjects with Mild Cognitive Impairment (MCI) and predict progression to dementia [3-5]. This suggests that assessment of IADL can be used to select MCI subjects at an increased risk for dementia [6]. After a diagnosis has been established, measuring IADL performance remains essential for the monitoring of clinical progression [7]. Finally, IADL assessment plays a pivotal role in clinical trials, particularly in the evaluation of symptomatic treatment in dementia due to Alzheimer's disease (AD) [8-10].

IADL performance is often measured using proxy-based questionnaires [11]. Unfortunately, most of these questionnaires suffer from serious limitations. They focus on everyday activities that are outdated and less relevant for patients in the early stages of dementia [12]. Furthermore, psychometric properties such as reliability, validity and responsiveness are often questionable or overlooked [13]. Recent studies have pointed out that improvements in IADL instruments are necessary, especially for detecting IADL problems in MCI and the early stages of dementia [14-17].

To overcome the above mentioned drawbacks of existing IADL scales, Sikkes et al. developed the Amsterdam IADL Questionnaire (A-IADL-Q). The A-IADL-Q is a 70-item proxy-based tool and was developed with input from clinicians, patients and caregivers [18]. Previous studies have reported good psychometric properties with respect to reliability, validity, responsiveness and diagnostic accuracy in dementia [19-21]. One disadvantage of the A-IADL-Q is its length, resulting in an administration time of 20-25 minutes. Additionally, respondents often report that some items are redundant or unclear. To facilitate administration and implementation on a wider scale, we aimed to design a short and more concise version of the A-IADL-Q.

The present paper describes the development and validation of a short version of the A-IADL-Q. We aimed to select the most informative items, using a combined approach of quantitative and qualitative methods. We expected that the short version would maintain the good psychometric quality of the original A-IADL-Q and that correspondence with the original version would be high. Lastly, we expected that IADL scores based on the short version would differ between diagnostic groups across the spectrum from normal cognition to dementia.

2. Methods

2.1. **Subjects.** We selected 1326 subjects with different levels of cognitive functioning, ranging from normal cognition to dementia. Their study partner, mainly a spouse, relative or friend, completed the A-IADL-Q. We included subjects from neurological memory clinics of the VU University Medical Center (VUmc) Alzheimer Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands ($n = 1117$), and the Alzheimer Center Rotterdam, The Netherlands ($n = 32$) and from the geriatric memory clinic of the VUmc, Amsterdam, The Netherlands ($n = 102$). All these subjects underwent a dementia assessment, including clinical history, medical and neurological examination, screening laboratory tests, a neuropsychological test battery and usually brain imaging. During this visit, study partners completed the A-IADL-Q on an iPad. Subjects' diagnoses were made in a multidisciplinary diagnostic meeting [3,22].

We included cognitively normal subjects ($n = 75$) from a Dutch cohort of the European Medical Information Framework for Alzheimer's disease (EMIF-AD)

project. This cohort consists of cognitively healthy monozygotic twins aged 60 or above. Inclusion criteria for this cohort were: Modified Telephone Interview for Cognitive Screening > 22; Geriatric Depression Scale < 11; Consortium to Establish a Registry for Alzheimer's Disease 10 word list immediate and delayed recall > 1.5 SD of age adjusted normative data; and Clinical Dementia Rating score of 0 with a score on the memory sub-domain of 0 [23-26]. During the baseline visit, study partners completed the A-IADL-Q on an iPad.

Data were collected between October 2012 and August 2015. All subjects gave written informed consent and all study partners gave oral informed consent. The Medical Ethical Committee of the VU University Medical Center approved the study.

2.2. **The Amsterdam IADL Questionnaire.** The original A-IADL-Q is a proxy-based scale with 70 items covering a broad range of cognitive IADL [18]. The items can be divided into eight subcategories: household, administration, work, computer use, leisure time, appliances, transport and other activities. The A-IADL-Q is computerized and has an adaptive approach as the items are tailored to individual responses (see Figure 1). This results in a minimum of 47 and a maximum of 70 items for each respondent. Difficulty in performance is rated on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 'no difficulty in performing this task' to 'no longer able to perform this task'. Scoring is based on Item Response Theory (IRT): a paradigm linking responses to a test battery to an underlying construct (or latent trait) [27]. For the A-IADL-Q, the construct underlying the items can be termed 'IADL performance'. That is, the latent trait reflects IADL impairment with higher estimated trait levels indicating more impairment.

Linking the probabilities of category-specific item responses to latent trait levels is based on an IRT model [27]. For the A-IADL-Q, the Graded Response Model (GRM) is used: a polytomous IRT model appropriate for items with ordinal response categories [28]. In the GRM, each item is characterized by a discrimination parameter (α) and 4 extremity parameters (β's; the number of response categories minus 1). The discrimination (or slope) parameter indicates how well an item discriminates between individuals with differing trait levels: higher discrimination parameters suggest higher ability to differentiate. The extremity (or category threshold) parameters represent the trait levels that mark the transition between response categories (in terms of cumulative probabilities for endorsement) [28]. An important advantage of IRT is that one's level of the latent trait can be estimated from any set of items for which the parameters are known. Therefore, IRT is able to handle missing data that may result from an adaptive approach. IRT is often preferred over classical scoring methods for scale development and refinement: it advances the development of more efficient scales by supporting item-reduction whilst preserving measurement precision [29,30].

The following basic assumptions underlie the IRT framework: (1) Unidimensionality, implying that a single latent trait underlies the items; (2) Local independence, which implies independence of item responses conditional on the latent trait; and (3) Monotonicity, implying that the probability of endorsing (a category-specific response to) an item should increase as the trait level increases [31]. Previous work showed that the A-IADL-Q could be adequately described by a single latent factor and that the assumptions of local independence and monotonicity were met as well


Did he/she carry out household duties in the past 4 weeks?
o Yes
Did he/she find it more difficult to perform household duties than he/she had in the past?
o No (0)
o Yes, slightly more difficult (1)
o Yes, more difficult (2)
o Yes, much more difficult (3)
o Yes, he/she is no longer able to perform this task (4)
o No
He/she did not carry out any household duties for the following reason:
o He/she was unable to do so due to his/her cognitive problems (4)
o He/she was unable to do so due to his/her physical problems (-)
o He/she has never done that before (-)
o Other, please state …… (-)
o Don't know
Item scored as missing (-). Questionnaire skips to next item.

FIGURE 1. Example item of the A-IADL-Q, including response options and scoring.

[19]. Since the current study contains a larger and more heterogenic sample, we have assessed these basic assumptions again.

2.3. **Procedures.** We divided the total sample into a training ($n = 662$) and validation set ($n = 664$), to use independent samples for the development and validation of the short version. We randomly split the Alzheimer Center Rotterdam cohort, the VUmc geriatric cohort and the cognitively healthy cohort. We conducted an alternative split procedure for the VUmc Alzheimer Center, as the original A-IADL-Q was developed based on a subsample ($n = 206$) of this cohort. We assigned this subsample to the training set before randomly assigning 35% of the remaining subjects to the training set and 65% to the validation set.

2.3.1. *Development procedure.* Item selection was performed in the training set, using a stepwise procedure that combined missing data, IRT and content aspects. As shown in Figure 1, a response is scored as missing when (1) the particular task has not been performed due to other reasons rather than cognitive problems or (2) the study partner does not know whether the subject has performed that particular task in the past four weeks. Items with higher percentages of missing responses give us a less direct view of cognitive IADL, and are thus less applicable for our goal. We therefore eliminated items with more than 80% overall missing data. Items with more than 60% missing data in all diagnostic groups were candidates for elimination.

IRT analyses. We explored whether all items met the basic assumptions for IRT and eliminated items that did not meet these conditions. In the subsequent refitting rounds, we used IRT to identify items that contributed little unique information to the model, as reflected in either low item information values (an index representing the precision with which the trait is measured) or overlapping Item Information Curves (IIC's; a mapping of the item information to the domain of the trait indicating how the information is distributed over the trait) with other items. After each elimination round, the GRM was refitted and an overall fit-assessment was performed. This resulted in new item parameters and IIC's that were used in the succeeding refitting round.

Content aspects. Comprehensibility was investigated using comments from a subset of respondents ($n = 585$) and interviewing a subsample of them ($n = 17$). Items that were often commented as either unclear or redundant were candidates for removal. Additionally, we investigated relevance and cultural applicability with an online survey that we distributed among 33 international experts. These experts were clinicians or researchers who had experience with the administration or cross-cultural validation of the A-IADL-Q. They were asked to rate the necessity of each item for inclusion in the short version on a visual analogue scale (VAS) ranging from 0 ('not necessary at all') to 100 ('very necessary').

2.3.2. *Validation procedure.* To confirm the quality of the final short version, we investigated missing data patterns, experts' ratings, adherence to IRT assumptions, as well as the overall fit of the short version items in the validation set. We subsequently investigated internal consistency of the short version and concordance between sum scores derived from the short and original version. To assess interpretability of the short version, we investigated differences in scores between six diagnostic groups that should represent different trait levels: (1) normal cognition (NC); (2) subjective cognitive decline (SCD); (3) mild cognitive impairment (MCI); (4) dementia due to AD (AD dementia); (5) dementia other than AD (non-AD dementia); and (6) another neurological or psychiatric disorder than dementia (Other).

2.4. **Statistical analyses.** Statistical analyses were performed using R and SPSS version 20.0 [32,33]. Statistical significance (for multiplicity corrections) was set at $p < .05$.

2.4.1. *Development analyses.* Item selection was partly based on IRT modeling. We used a GRM with a logit link function [28]. This model was fitted on the basis of approximate marginal maximum likelihood (MML) estimation [34]. The latent trait was assumed to follow a standard normal distribution. We assessed unidimensionality by performing an eigenvalue decomposition on the matrix of robust (Spearman) correlations between the items. A difference approximation to the second-order derivatives along the eigenvalue curve (scree plot) was calculated. This acceleration-approximation indicates points of abrupt change along the eigenvalue curve [35]. The number of eigenvalues before the point with the most abrupt change (the point with the maximum acceleration value) represents the number of latent dimensions that dominate the information content. Local independence was assessed by inspecting residual correlation matrices. We considered residual correlations above .25 as indicative of problematic item pairs. We evaluated the monotonicity assumption using Mokken scale analysis [36]. Items that gave at least

1 violation of manifest monotonicity and had a crit value over 30 were considered to violate latent monotonicity [37]. We assessed basic model fit by comparing nested models: we employed a likelihood ratio test (LRT) to evaluate if the full GRM provided a better fit than a constrained GRM with equal slope parameters across items [27].

2.4.2. *Validation analyses.* We fitted a GRM on the final set of retained items. Estimation and assumption evaluation for this model were performed as described above. This model was also compared to a constrained GRM as a means of basic model fit assessment. In addition, we evaluated global fitness of the final model with the comparative fit index (CFI) and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) [38]. Trait (or factor) scores were then based on empirical Bayes estimates: the mode of the posterior distribution of the trait given the retained items evaluated at the MML estimates. We calculated internal consistency of the retained items using a robust version of McDonald's omega [39]. We examined concordance between sum-scores derived from the short and original versions using Kendall's W [40]. To assess whether the short version scores differed between the diagnostic groups, we used a Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test on the trait scores followed by Dunn's pairwise test for multiple comparisons of mean rank sums (a nonparametric alternative to ANOVA followed by post-hoc tests) [41]. Multiple testing correction was based on the Bonferroni method.

3. Results

3.1. **Sample and item characteristics.** The study sample consisted of subjects with NC ($n = 75$), SCD ($n = 219$), MCI ($n = 138$), AD dementia ($n = 413$), non-AD dementia ($n = 235$) and 246 subjects with other diagnoses. Table 1 shows subject characteristics for the total sample and for the training and validation set separately. There were no age and gender differences between the two sets. The MCI group was slightly larger in the training set, whilst the non-AD dementia group was slightly larger in the validation set.

Missing responses on item level in the training set ranged from 10.6% ('preparing sandwich meals') to 92.6% ('programming a video recorder'). Approximately half of the original version items (36/70) contained more than 50% missing data. Mean experts' ratings ranged from 23.9 ('programming a video recorder') to 86.9 ('paying when doing the shopping'), with an overall mean score of 62.3 (SD = 14.9).

3.2. **Development of the short version.** Figure 2 provides a flow-chart of the item selection procedure. Our first step included the removal of 2 items that violated the assumption of monotonicity, together with 7 items that contained more than 80% missing data. After the second round, we removed 11 items with missing responses above 60% in all diagnostic groups and contributing little information to the model (item information < 3.0). After the third round, we removed 8 items that received low ratings of experts (mean rating < 50) and had often been criticized by respondents. We thereafter removed 6 items with overlapping IIC's and overlapping content with other items within the same activity category (e.g., 'cooking' versus 'preparing hot meals'). Of these overlapping pairs, we removed the one containing higher missing data and lower content rating. After the fourth round, we removed 4 items that were often perceived as unclear and showed overlapping IIC's with more specific items (e.g., 'looking for important things at home' versus 'looking for

TABLE 1. Subject characteristics. Abbreviations: NC = normal cognition, SCD = subjective cognitive decline, MCI = mild cognitive impairment, AD = Alzheimer's disease. † Tested using independent t-test. ‡ Tested using Pearson's Chi-Square test.

		Total sample ($n = 1326$)	Training set ($n = 662$)	Validation set ($n = 664$)	p-value
Age, M (SD)		65.3 (9.6)	65.5 (9.9)	65.1 (9.3)	0.501†
Gender, female (%)		585 (44.1%)	293 (44.3%)	292 (44.0%)	0.917‡
Diagnosis					
	NC	75 (5.7%)	37 (5.6%)	38 (5.7%)	
	SCD	219 (16.5%)	116 (17.5%)	103 (15.5%)	
	MCI	138 (10.4%)	84 (12.7%)	54 (8.1%)	
	AD dementia	413 (31.1%)	209 (31.6%)	204 (30.7%)	
	non-AD dementia	235 (17.7%)	100 (15.1%)	135 (20.3%)	
	Other	246 (18.6%)	116 (17.5%)	130 (19.6%)	

his/her keys'). Following this, we refitted the model with the remaining 32 items and concluded that further shortening was unnecessary. All 32 retained items in the training set were deemed to contribute substantially unique information to the latent trait. The full GRM model improved fit upon the constrained GRM model (LRT value = 109.74, df = 31, $p < .001$).


Original A-IADL-Q: 70 items
9 items removed due to
- missing data > 80 %
- violation IRT assumptions
61 items
11 items removed due to:
- missing data in all groups > 60%
- item information value < 3.0
50 items
8 items removed due to:
- low expert ratings
- often critizied by respondents
42 items
6 items removed due to:
- overlapping content within activity category
- overlapping item information curves
36 items
4 items removed due to:
- perceived as unclear by respondents
- overlapping item information curves
A-IADL-Q Short Version: 32 items

FIGURE 2. Flowchart of the item selection procedure that led to the short version of the Amsterdam IADL Questionnaire (A-IADL-Q). Abbreviation: IRT = Item Response Theory.

3.3. **Validation of the short version.** Table 2 presents the final selection of items, information on missing percentages and the estimated GRM parameters

TABLE 2. Final selection of the short version items, including their missing data percentages, GRM parameters, item information values and content ratings by experts. Abbreviations: GRM = Graded Response Model, α = discrimination parameter, β's = extremity parameters. NOTE: Percentage missing, parameter estimates and information characteristics are based on the validation set. Expert ratings were made per item on a visual analogue scale ranging from 0 to 100.

Item		% Missing	Item param.					Item information	Expert rating
			α	β_1	β_2	β_3	β_4		
1	Carrying out household duties	12.5	1.764	-0.631	0.313	1.374	2.292	4.52	76
2	Doing the shopping	14.0	1.897	-0.674	0.413	1.213	1.786	4.59	79
4	Buying the correct articles	34.5	1.440	-0.243	0.820	1.311	1.349	2.48	73
6	Cooking	33.7	1.957	-0.688	0.459	1.004	1.418	4.4	76
9	Preparing sandwich meals	10.4	2.477	0.590	1.556	2.281	2.532	5.99	60
10	Making minor repairs to the house	52.6	2.245	-0.946	0.074	0.635	1.031	5.25	60
11	Operating domestic appliances	8.1	2.019	-0.129	0.873	1.524	2.164	4.88	63
12	Operating the microwave oven	30.3	1.781	0.129	1.036	1.543	1.941	3.6	58
16	Operating the coffee maker	11.4	2.723	0.636	1.396	1.828	2.027	5.88	63
17	Operating the washing machine	42.3	3.893	0.475	1.076	1.315	1.386	8.0	58
19	Paying bills	35.2	2.857	-0.470	0.257	0.579	0.748	5.9	83
22	Using a mobile phone	17.0	2.051	-0.478	0.625	1.290	1.814	4.96	76
23	Managing the household budget	45.5	2.980	-0.817	-0.012	0.320	0.622	6.81	79
25	Using electronic banking	48.6	3.517	-0.329	0.248	0.465	0.528	6.75	66
28	Using a pin code	11.9	2.149	0.126	1.027	1.437	1.880	4.66	77
29	Obtaining money from a cash machine	33.0	3.565	0.318	0.743	1.142	1.299	7.48	69
30	Paying using cash	16.0	2.718	0.386	1.282	1.726	2.304	6.93	72
31	Making appointments	17.5	1.809	-0.739	0.408	1.163	1.685	4.23	75
32	Filling in forms	24.7	2.487	-0.836	0.002	0.627	0.927	5.8	66
33	Working	47.6	1.388	-1.059	-0.225	0.452	0.849	2.58	70
35	Using a computer	23.5	2.100	-0.759	0.266	1.025	1.629	5.28	68
37	Emailing	45.2	3.061	-0.336	0.238	0.792	1.022	6.97	54
39	Printing documents	57.7	4.128	-0.126	0.503	0.644	0.686	8.08	70
46	Operating devices	16.4	3.505	-0.399	0.495	1.066	1.708	10.6	72
47	Operating the remote control	2.9	1.766	-0.047	1.106	1.700	2.568	4.25	80
50	Operating a DVD-player	58.7	3.488	-0.330	0.296	0.677	0.767	7.5	42
57	Playing card and board games	50.5	1.608	-0.518	0.583	1.250	1.742	3.44	62
59	Driving a car	26.4	1.476	-0.348	0.664	1.103	1.407	2.69	76
65	Using a sat-nav system	51.5	2.423	-0.433	0.410	0.792	0.840	4.69	61
66	Using public transport	47.4	3.021	-0.075	0.458	0.943	1.275	6.87	83
68	Looking for his/her keys	46.5	1.666	-1.465	-0.021	0.952	2.978	4.99	69
70	Being responsible for his/her own medication	27.1	1.426	-0.162	0.995	1.642	2.319	3.02	82

based on the validation set. The last column shows the experts' ratings. As can be seen, all retained items contain less than 60% missing data and most items (27/32) had less than 50% missing data in the validation set. The extremity parameters were spread along the latent trait continuum (ranging from -4 to $+4$), which is also illustrated by the IIC's presented in Figure 3. For most items, item information values were above 3 (on a total information of 174.08). Lastly, all short version items received medium to high ratings from experts, except for item 50 ('operating a DVD-player'), which was retained for its high information contribution to the latent trait.

The full GRM model provided better fit on the validation data than the constrained GRM model (LRT value = 8574.13, df = 31, $p < .001$). The overall fit of the final model was considered good: CFI = .994, RMSEA = .032. Internal consistency of the short version was high (robust McDonald's omega = .981). Concordance between the item sum-scores of the short version and the original version was high (Kendall's $W = .976$).

Figure 4 represents the trait score distributions for each diagnostic group. It can be seen that this score seems to increase from normal cognition to dementia. The variances of the trait scores were not equal between diagnostic groups. Hence, a nonparametric test was employed to assess diagnostic-group-differences between latent trait scores as derived from the final GRM model. The Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test indicated that the mean trait score ranks of the diagnosis groups indeed differed ($\chi^2 = 161.95$, df $= 5$, $p < .001$). Pairwise comparisons (Dunn's test) with Bonferroni correction indicated the following pairwise differences: (1) NC versus all other groups (all corrected p-values $< .001$); (2) SCD versus AD dementia, non-AD dementia and Other group (all corrected p-values $< .001$); and (3) MCI versus AD dementia (corrected p-value $= .0024$).



FIGURE 3. Item information curves of the 32 Amsterdam IADL items that resulted in the short version. The bold black line represents the total test information curve. Latent trait ranges from −4 (good IADL functioning) to +4 (poor IADL functioning).

4. DISCUSSION

We designed a short version of the A-IADL-Q (A-IADL-Q-SV) containing 32 items. We thereby reduced administration time with approximately 10 minutes. We showed that, although significantly shorter, the A-IADL-Q-SV has maintained the psychometric quality of the original version. We demonstrated adequate measurement precision along the entire spectrum of IADL functioning. We also found that the A-IADL-Q-SV could differentiate between various diagnostic groups with respect to IADL impairment.

The current study expands on previous work on the A-IADL-Q, which already demonstrated good psychometric quality of the scale [18-21]. The A-IADL-Q-SV contains only the most informative items, and thereby possible 'noise' caused by less informative or ambiguous items has been reduced. Because of its reduced length, the A-IADL-Q-SV may be perceived as a more user-friendly measure. The use of shorter tests is also encouraged from a psychometric point of view: a short form



FIGURE 4. Short version trait scores for each diagnostic group. Post-hoc analyses gave the following significant pairwise differences: (1) NC vs. all other groups; (2) SCD vs. AD dementia, non-AD dementia and Other group; and (3) MCI vs. AD dementia. Abbreviations: NC = normal cognition, SCD = subjective cognitive decline, MCI = mild cognitive impairment, AD = Alzheimer's disease.

containing items of the same quality as the original form may yield less measurement error and thus be more reliable [27]. Longer tests are more likely to suffer from acquiescence bias and missing responses. Using the A-IADL-Q-SV may overcome these test-length related drawbacks.

Our findings suggest that the A-IADL-Q-SV can already detect IADL problems in subjects with SCD and MCI, which is in line with previous studies that report subtle functional impairment in these groups [42-44]. We found that IADL scores differed between subjects with NC and SCD. This is of particular interest since both groups are characterized by the absence of objective cognitive impairment, although SCD subjects may be at higher risk of developing dementia [45]. The A-IADL-Q-SV might thus be able to detect subtle functional decline that appears in preclinical stages of dementia, suggesting that it could be a promising measure clinical trials in these earliest stages [10,46].

Strengths of this study include our large and heterogenic sample with subjects covering a broad range of the IADL spectrum along the continuum from normal ageing to dementia. Another strength is the use of a validation set to replicate findings derived from the training set. After splitting the total sample, the training and validation set both contained more than 500 subjects, a number that is recommended for estimating accurate parameters based on the GRM [47]. Finally,

combining statistical methods with input from respondents and experts is an important strength of this study, as it preserved both the psychometric quality and clinical relevance of the A-IADL-Q-SV.

There are some limitations that should be considered. Among them are our relatively small NC group, due to the fact that most subjects were recruited via memory clinics. Additionally, our NC group consisted of monozygotic twin pairs, which may hamper generalizability to cognitively normal singletons. However, Simmons et al. showed that older twins are similar to a representative sample of singletons of the same age with respect to health status [48]. Lastly, previous studies have shown that proxy-based IADL measures may be confounded by respondent characteristics such as caregiver burden and depression [49]. We did not take these characteristics into account in the current study. However, Sikkes et al. showed low correlations between the original A-IADL-Q, caregiver burden and depression, indicating limited confounding by these variables [19].

Further research is needed to examine whether the A-IADLQ-SV is sensitive to changes over time within subjects. We will investigate the A-IADL-Q-SV longitudinally in subjects with MCI and early dementia, in order to determine whether it could be an effective measure for monitoring disease progression and evaluating disease-modifying therapies. Since the research field is shifting towards preclinical stages of dementia, it is also relevant to further investigate the A-IADL-SV in subjects with SCD and the relation between IADL scores and dementia biomarkers in this group.

To conclude, we developed a short version of the A-IADL-Q, which is a concise instrument to efficiently measure functional decline in the early stages of dementia. The A-IADL-Q-SV has retained the good qualities of the original A-IADL-Q; hence, we recommend using the short version as an outcome for daily function in dementia research as well as in clinical practice.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all respondents and experts for their willingness to participate in this study. We also would like to thank Naomi Koster, Saskia de Vries, Judith Meurs, Iris Dalhuizen and Tarik Binnenkade for their help with the data collection. The development of the Amsterdam IADL Questionnaire is supported by grants from Stichting VUmc Fonds and Innovatiefonds Zorgverzekeraars. The current study is supported by a grant from Memorabel (research programme of the Deltaplan for dementia). This work has received support from the EU/EFPIA Innovative Medicines Initiative Joint Undertaking (EMIF grant no. 115372). Part of this paper has been presented at the 2016 AAIC conference.

The Amsterdam IADL Questionnaire is free for use in all public health and not-for-profit agencies and can be obtained from the authors following a simple registration.

References

[1] American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 5th Edition. Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing; 2013.

[2] Lawton MP, Brody EM. Assessment of older people: self-maintaining and instrumental activities of daily living. Gerontologist 1969;9:179-86.

[3] Albert MS, Dekosky ST, Dickson D, Dubois B, Feldman HH, Fox NC, et al. The diagnosis of mild cognitive impairment due to Alzheimer's disease?: Recommendations from the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association workgroups on diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimer's Dement 2011;7:270-9. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2011.03.008.

[4] Petersen RC, Caracciolo B, Brayne C, Gauthier S, Jelic V, Fratiglioni L. Mild cognitive impairment: a concept in evolution. J Intern Med 2014;275:214-28. doi:10.1111/joim.12190.

[5] Luck T, Luppa M, Wiese B, Maier W, van den Bussche H, Eisele M, et al. Prediction of incident dementia: impact of impairment in instrumental activities of daily living and mild cognitive impairment-results from the German study on ageing, cognition, and dementia in primary care patients. Am J Geriatr Psychiatry 2012;20:943-54. doi:10.1097/JGP.0b013e31825c09bc.

[6] Tabert MH, Albert SM, Borukhova-Milov L, Camacho Y, Pelton G, Liu X, et al. Functional deficits in patients with mild cognitive impairment: prediction of AD. Neurology 2002;58:758-64.

[7] Rockwood K. The measuring, meaning and importance of activities of daily living (ADLs) as an outcome. Int Psychogeriatrics 2007;19:467-82. doi:10.1017/S1041610207004966.

[8] Woodcock J, Sharfstein JM, Hamburg M. Regulatory action on rosiglitazone by the US Food and Drug Administration. N Engl J Med 2010;363:1489-91.

[9] Vellas B, Andrieu S, Sampaio C, Coley N, Wilcock G. Endpoints for trials in Alzheimer's disease: a European task force consensus. Lancet Neurol 2008;7:436-50. doi:10.1016/S1474-4422(08)70087-5.

[10] Vellas B, Bateman R, Blennow K, Frisoni G, Johnson K, Katz R, et al. Endpoints for Pre-Dementia AD Trials: A Report from the EU/US/CTAD Task Force. J Prev Alzheimer's Dis 2015;2:128-35. doi:10.14283/jpad.2015.55.

[11] Marshall GA, Amariglio RE, Sperling RA, Rentz DM. Activities of daily living: where do they fit in the diagnosis of Alzheimer's disease? Neurodegener Dis Manag 2012;2:483-91. doi:10.2217/nmt.12.55.

[12] Rosenberg L, Kottorp A, Winblad B, Nygrd L. Perceived difficulty in everyday technology use among older adults with or without cognitive deficits. Scand J Occup Ther 2009;16:216-26.

[13] Sikkes SAM, de Lange-de Klerk ESM, Pijnenburg YAL, Scheltens P, Uitdehaag BMJ. A systematic review of Instrumental Activities of Daily Living scales in dementia: room for improvement. J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry 2009;80:7-12. doi:10.1136/jnnp.2008.155838.

[14] Law LLF, Barnett F, Yau MK, Gray MA. Measures of everyday competence in older adults with cognitive impairment: a systematic review. Age Ageing 2012;41:9-16. doi:10.1093/ageing/afr104.

[15] Gold DA. An examination of instrumental activities of daily living assessment in older adults and mild cognitive impairment. J Clin Exp Neuropsychol 2012;34:11-34. doi:10.1080/13803395.2011.614598.

[16] Jekel K, Damian M, Wattmo C, Hausner L, Bullock R, Connelly PJ, et al. Mild cognitive impairment and deficits in instrumental activities of daily living: a systematic review. Alzheimers Res Ther 2015;7:17. doi:10.1186/s13195-015-0099-0.

[17] Kaur N, Belchior P, Gelinas I, Bier N. Critical appraisal of questionnaires to assess functional impairment in individuals with mild cognitive impairment. Int Psychogeriatr 2016:1-15. doi:10.1017/S104161021600017X.

[18] Sikkes SAM, de Lange-de Klerk ESM, Pijnenburg YAL, Gillissen F, Romkes R, Knol DL, et al. A new informant-based questionnaire for instrumental activities of daily living in dementia. Alzheimer's Dement 2012;8:536-43. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2011.08.006.

[19] Sikkes SAM, Knol DL, Pijnenburg YAL, de Lange-de Klerk ESM, Uitdehaag BMJ, Scheltens P. Validation of the Amsterdam IADL Questionnaire©, a new tool to measure instrumental activities of daily living in dementia. Neuroepidemiology 2013;41:35-41. doi:10.1159/000346277.

[20] Sikkes SAM, Pijnenburg YAL, Knol DL, de Lange-de Klerk ESM, Scheltens P, Uitdehaag BMJ. Assessment of instrumental activities of daily living in dementia: diagnostic value of the Amsterdam Instrumental Activities of Daily Living Questionnaire. J Geriatr Psychiatry Neurol 2013;26:244-50. doi:10.1177/0891988713509139.

[21] Koster N, Knol DL, Uitdehaag BMJ, Scheltens P, Sikkes S a. M. The sensitivity to change over time of the Amsterdam IADL Questionnaire. Alzheimer's Dement 2015:1-10. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2014.10.006.

[22] Mckhann GM, Knopman DS, Chertkow H, Hyman BT, Jack CR, Kawas CH, et al. The diagnosis of dementia due to Alzheimer's disease?: Recommendations from the National Institute on Aging-Alzheimer's Association workgroups on diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimer's Dement 2011;7:263-9. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2011.03.005.

[23] Graff-Radford NR, Ferman TJ, Lucas JA, Johnson HK, Parfitt FC, Heckman MG, et al. A cost effective method of identifying and recruiting persons over 80 free of dementia or mild cognitive impairment. Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord 2006;20:101-4.

[24] Yesavage JA, Brink TL, Rose TL, Lum O, Huang V, Adey M, et al. Development and validation of a geriatric depression screening scale: a preliminary report. J Psychiatr Res 1983;17:37-49.

[25] Welsh KA, Butters N, Mohs RC, Beekly D, Edland S, Fillenbaum G, et al. The Consortium to Establish a Registry for Alzheimer's Disease (CERAD). Part V. A normative study of the neuropsychological battery. Neurology 1994;44:609.

[26] Hughes CP, Berg L, Danziger WL, Coben LA, Martin R. A new clinical scale for the staging of dementia. Br J Psychiatry 1982;140:566-72.

[27] Embretson SE, Reise SP. Item response theory. Psychology Press; 2013.

[28] Samejima F. Estimation of latent ability using a response pattern of graded scores. Psychometrika 1970;35:139. doi:10.1007/BF02290599.

[29] Reise SP, Waller NG. Item response theory and clinical measurement. Annu Rev Clin Psychol 2009;5:27-48. doi:10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.032408.153553.

[30] Chang C-H, Reeve BB. Item response theory and its applications to patient-reported outcomes measurement. Eval Health Prof 2005;28:264-82. doi:10.1177/0163278705278275.

[31] Edelen MO, Reeve BB. Applying item response theory (IRT) modeling to questionnaire development, evaluation, and refinement. Qual Life Res 2007;16:5-18. doi:10.1007/s11136-007-9198-0.

[32] R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. 2013.
[33] IBM. IBM SPSS statistics for Windows, version 20.0. New York IBM Corp 2011.
[34] Rizopoulos D. ltm: An R package for latent variable modeling and item response theory analyses. J Stat Softw 2006;17:1-25. doi:10.18637/jss.v017.i05.
[35] Raîche G, Walls TA, Magis D, Riopel M, Blais J-G. Non-Graphical Solutions for Cattell's Scree Test. Methodology 2013;9:23-9. doi:10.1027/1614-2241/a000051.
[36] van der Ark LA. Mokken Scale Analysis in R. J Stat Softw 2007;20:183-208. doi:10.1007/s11336-007-9034-z.
[37] van Schuur W. Ordinal item response theory: Mokken scale analysis. vol. 169. Sage Publications; 2011.
[38] Maydeu-Olivares A. Goodness-of-Fit Assessment of Item Response Theory Models. Meas Interdiscip Res Perspect 2013;11:71-101. doi:10.1080/15366367.2013.831680.
[39] Zhang Z, Yuan K-H. Robust Coefficients Alpha and Omega and Confidence Intervals With Outlying Observations and Missing Data: Methods and Software. Educ Psychol Meas 2016;76:387-411. doi:10.1177/0013164415594658.
[40] Kendall MG, Babington B. The Problem of m Rankings. The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 2016;10:275-87.
[41] Dunn OJ. Multiple Comparisons Using Rank Sums. Technometrics 1964;6:241-52. doi:10.1080/00401706.1964.10490181.
[42] Farias ST, Mungas D, Reed BR, Harvey D, Cahn-Weiner D, Decarli C. MCI is associated with deficits in everyday functioning. Alzheimer Dis Assoc Disord 2006;20:217-23. doi:10.1097/01.wad.0000213849.51495.d9.
[43] Pedrosa H, De Sa A, Guerreiro M, Maroco J, Simoes MR, Galasko D, et al. Functional evaluation distinguishes MCI patients from healthy elderly people–the ADCS/MCI/ADL scale. J Nutr Health Aging 2010;14:703-9.
[44] Teng E, Becker BW, Woo E, Cummings JL, Lu PH. Subtle deficits in instrumental activities of daily living in subtypes of mild cognitive impairment. Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord 2010;30:189-97. doi:10.1159/000313540.
[45] Jessen F, Amariglio RE, Van Boxtel M, Breteler M, Ceccaldi M, Chtelat G, et al. A conceptual framework for research on subjective cognitive decline in preclinical Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimer's Dement 2014;10:844-52.
[46] Snyder PJ, Kahle-Wrobleski K, Brannan S, Miller DS, Schindler RJ, Desanti S, et al. Assessing cognition and function in Alzheimer's disease clinical trials: Do we have the right tools? Alzheimer's Dement 2014;10:853-60. doi:10.1016/j.jalz.2014.07.158.
[47] Tsutakawa RK, Johnson JC. The effect of uncertainty of item parameter estimation on ability estimates. Psychometrika 1990;55:371-90. doi:10.1007/BF02295293.
[48] Simmons SF, Johansson B, Zarit SH, Ljungquist B, Plomin R, Mcclearn GE. Selection bias in samples of older twins? A comparison between octogenarian twins and singletons in Sweden. J Aging Health 1997;9:553-67.
[49] Jorm A. Complaints of cognitive decline in the elderly: a comparison of reports by subjects and informants in a community survey. Psychol Med 1997;24:365-74.

(Roos J. Jutten) Alzheimer Center and Dept. of Neurology, Amsterdam Neuroscience, VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
E-mail address: r.jutten@vumc.nl

(Carel F.W. Peeters) Dept. of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, VU University medical center Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
E-mail address: cf.peeters@vumc.nl

(Sophie M.J. Leijdesdorff) Alzheimer Center Rotterdam, Erasmus Medical Center, Rotterdam, The Netherlands
E-mail address: s.leijdesdorff@erasmusmc.nl

(Pieter Jelle Visser) Alzheimer Center and Dept. of Neurology, Amsterdam Neuroscience, VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; and Alzheimer Center, School for Mental Health and Neuroscience, University Medical Centre Maastricht, Maastricht, The Netherlands
E-mail address: pj.visser@maastrichtuniversity.nl

(Andrea B. Maier) MOVE Research Institute Amsterdam, Department of Human Movement Sciences, VU University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; and Dept. of Medicine and Aged Care, Royal Melbourne Hospital, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia
E-mail address: a.b.maier@vu.nl

(Caroline B. Terwee) Dept. of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, VU University medical center Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; and The EMGO Institute for Health and Care Research, VU University Medical Center Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
E-mail address: cb.terwee@vumc.nl

(Philip Scheltens) Alzheimer Center and Dept. of Neurology, Amsterdam Neuroscience, VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
E-mail address: p.scheltens@vumc.nl

(Sietske A.M. Sikkes) Alzheimer Center and Dept. of Neurology, Amsterdam Neuroscience, VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; and Dept. of Epidemiology & Biostatistics, VU University medical center Amsterdam, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
E-mail address: s.sikkes@vumc.nl